1 2 FILED 3 APR 0 1 2011 4 RICHARD W. WIEKING 5 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ERIC HENRY SALDIVAR, No. C 10-03809 JW (PR) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER OF SERVICE: DIRECTING 13 DEFENDANTS TO FILE DISPOSITIVE VS. MOTION OR NOTICE REGARDING 14 SUCH MOTION; INSTRUCTIONS TO MICHAEL SAYRE MD, et. al., **CLERK** 15 16 Defendants. 17 Plaintiff, a prisoner at Pelican Bay State Prison ("PBSP") in Crescent City, 18 California, filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, challenging the 19 conditions of his confinement. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis 20 will be granted in a separate order. In this order, the Court will conduct its initial review 21 of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. 22 23 24 DISCUSSION Standard of Review A. 25 Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners 26

27

28

B

seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. <u>Id.</u> at 1915A(b)(1), (2).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that a person acting under the color of state law committed a violation of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Pleadings filed by pro se litigants, however, must be liberally construed. Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010); Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

## B. Plaintiff's Claim

Plaintiff claims that PBSP defendants Michael Sayre, Chief Medical Officer, Sue Risenhoover, MD, Phillip Grimm, Radiologist, Helmuth Vollger, Radiologist/Radiology Technician, Jim Flowers, RN, Chris McAllister, LVN, N. Adam, MD, and Maureen McLean, FNP, were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Liberally construed, plaintiff's claim against these defendants appears cognizable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. All other named defendants, i.e., defendant "PCP Clinic" and all "Doe Defendants" are DISMISSED.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court orders as follows:

1. The clerk of the Court shall issue summons and the United States
Marshal shall serve, without prepayment of fees, a copy of the complaint, all attachments
thereto, and a copy of this order upon defendants Michael Sayre, Chief Medical
Officer, Sue Risenhoover, MD, Phillip Grimm, Radiologist, Helmuth Vollger,
Radiologist/Radiology Technician, Jim Flowers, RN, Chris McAllister, LVN, N.

Adam, MD, and Maureen McLean, FNP, at Pelican Bay State Prison, (P.O. Box 7000, Crescent City, CA 95531-7000). All other named defendants, i.e., defendant "PCP Clinic" and all "Doe Defendants" are DISMISSED.

- 2. No later than **ninety (90) days** from the date of this order, defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the claims in the complaint found to be cognizable above.
- a. If defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003), cert. denied Alameida v. Terhune, 540 U.S. 810 (2003).
- b. Any motion for summary judgment shall be supported by adequate factual documentation and shall conform in all respects to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendants are advised that summary judgment cannot be granted, nor qualified immunity found, if material facts are in dispute. If any defendant is of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, he shall so inform the Court prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.
- 3. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and served on defendants no later than **thirty (30) days** from the date defendants' motion is filed.
- a. In the event the defendants file an unenumerated motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b), plaintiff is hereby cautioned as follows:<sup>1</sup>

The defendants have made a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on the ground you have not exhausted your administrative remedies. The motion will, if granted, result in the dismissal of your case. When a party you are suing makes a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust, and that

The following notice is adapted from the summary judgment notice to be given to pro se prisoners as set forth in Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). See Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d at 1120 n.14.

11 12

10

14

15

13

1617

18

19

20

22

21

24

2526

27

28

motion is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony) and/or documents, you may not simply rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or documents, that contradict the facts shown in the defendant's declarations and documents and show that you have in fact exhausted your claims. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition, the motion to dismiss, if appropriate, may be granted and the case dismissed.

b. In the event defendants file a motion for summary judgment, the Ninth Circuit has held that the following notice should be given to plaintiffs:

The defendants have made a motion for summary judgment by which they seek to have your case dismissed. A motion for summary judgment under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will, if granted, end your case.

Rule 56 tells you what you must do in order to oppose a motion for summary judgment. Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is no genuine issue of material fact – that is, if there is no real dispute about any fact that would affect the result of your case, the party who asked for summary judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will end your case. When a party you are suing makes a motion for summary judgment that is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot simply rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or authenticated documents, as provided in Rule 56(e), that contradict the facts shown in the defendants' declarations and documents and show that there is a genuine issue of material fact for trial. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition, summary judgment, if appropriate, may be entered against you. If summary judgment is granted in favor of defendants, your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial.

See Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). Plaintiff is advised to read Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment must come forward with evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim). Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file an opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment may be deemed to be a consent by plaintiff to the granting of the motion, and granting of judgment against plaintiff without a trial. See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam); Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994).

4. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fifteen (15) days** after plaintiff's opposition is filed.

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 5. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.
- 6. All communications by the plaintiff with the Court must be served on defendants, or defendants' counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true copy of the document to defendants or defendants' counsel.
- 7. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local Rule 16-1 is required before the parties may conduct discovery.
- 8. It is plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
- 9. Extensions of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought to be extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 28,2011

**Inited States District Chief Judge** 

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

### FOR THE

### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

Case Number: CV10-03809 JW

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

v.

MICHAEL SAYRE et al,

Defendant.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on April 1, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Eric Henry Saldivar D-39990 Pelican Bay State Prison D-2/222 P.O. Box 7500 Crescent City, CA 95532

Dated: April 1, 2011

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk /s/ By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk